

REMARKS**Summary of the Final Office Action**

Claims 1-4 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Von Gutfeld* (USPN 6,219,126).

Claims 5-7 and 9-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Von Gutfeld* (USPN 6,219,126) in view of *Ishihara et al.* (USPN 6,219,126).

Summary of the Response to the Final Office Action

Applicant has amended claims 1, 4 and 5, and has canceled claims 2-3 and 6-7 without prejudice or disclaimer. Accordingly, claims 1, 4-5, and 8-10 are presently pending.

The Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(e) and 103(a)

Claims 1-4 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Von Gutfeld* (USPN 6,219,126). Claims 5-7 and 9-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Von Gutfeld* (USPN 6,219,126) in view of *Ishihara et al.* (USPN 6,219,126). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections for at least the following reasons.

The Final Office Action asserts that *Von Gutfeld* discloses an embodiment in which vent hole are not formed. However, Applicant respectfully asserts that *Von Gutfeld* admits the difficulty of selecting quantity of the LC material in an LCD panel having a barrier fillet and a sealant surrounding the barrier fillet, and then, recognizes the exiting of the excess LC material as a valued portion through the descriptions. In addition, *Von Gutfeld* also discloses an LCD panel having a pair of spaced-apart glass spacer fillet 3a and 3b, thereby catching any spillover

of liquid crystal (LC) material in the space between fillet 3a and fillet 3c. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that the Final Office Action has not considered *Von Gutfeld* as a whole.

Furthermore, in the present invention, the protrusion is formed with any one of metal, ITO and organic insulating film as claimed in claims 8 and 9, which are generally the same material as those used in the fabricating processes for the substrate as is well known in the art. As a result, the protrusion can be formed when the substrate is fabricated, thereby simplifying the process for fabricating the LCD panel. In contrast, the barrier fillet of *Von Gutfeld* is formed with a hard material such as glass. Consequently, the barrier fillet must be formed as a separate process with respect to the other fabricating processes for the substrate, thereby causing increased steps and complication in fabricating the LCD panel.

The claimed present invention uses dispensing the LC material onto the picture display area -- not dropping the LC material.

Therefore, while *Von Gutfeld* teaches an LCD panel having a sealant and barrier fillet, Applicants respectfully submit that the present invention as claimed is clearly distinguished over the device of *Von Gutfeld*. In particular, the present invention has a feature that a liquid crystal is evenly dispersed onto the picture display area and further a protrusion is formed when a substrate is fabricated. In view of these points, we believe that the present invention should be distinguished from *Von Gutfeld*.

In addition, Applicant respectfully notes that the Final Office Action has not relied on *Ishihara et al.* to teach or suggest these features. Moreover, Applicant respectfully asserts that *Ishihara et al.* does not remedy these deficiencies.

Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(e) and 103(a) should be withdrawn because the applied references, whether taken singly or combined, do not teach or suggest each feature of independent claims 1 and 5, as amended. Further, Applicant respectfully asserts that dependent claims 4 and 8-10 are allowable at least because of their respective dependence from independent claims 1 and 5, as amended, and the reasons set forth above.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendments to place the application in clear condition for allowance or, in the alternative, in better form for appeal. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of the response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under

37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: 

Robert J. Goodell
Reg. No. 41,040

Dated: November 20, 2003

Customer Number 009629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20004
Phone: 202-739-3000
Facsimile: 202-739-3001